

Appl. No. 10/535,436
Docket No. Z-7814Q
Reply to Office Action mailed on September 1, 2010
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 11-30 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claims 2, 4, and 10 were previously canceled without prejudice.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the injection molded part in accordance with the teachings of the specification. Support for the amendment is found at paragraph 29 of the published specification.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Nishihira et al. in view of Morawski

Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 11-30 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishihira et al. (4,330,578) in view of Morawski (US 2001/0002605). This rejection is respectfully traversed by Applicants since the combination does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because it does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of independent claims 1 and 20. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In order for the Office to show a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness, M.P.E.P. §2142 requires a clear articulation of the reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious. Specifically, the Supreme Court in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 500 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007) noted that the burden lies initially with the Office to provide an explicit analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. “[R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained with mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” The Court in *KSR International* further identified a number of rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness which are

Appl. No. 10/535,436
Docket No. Z-7814Q
Reply to Office Action mailed on September 1, 2010
Customer No. 27752

consistent with the proper “functional approach” to the determination of obviousness as laid down in *Graham v. John Deere Co.* 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966).

Specifically, as previously required by the TSM (teaching, suggestion, motivation) approach to obviousness, one exemplary rationale indicated requires teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art reference that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, to reject a claim based on this rationale, the Office must articulate the following: (1) a finding that there was some teaching, suggestion, or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings to arrive at each and every limitation of the claimed invention; (2) a finding that there was a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) whatever additional findings based on the *Graham* factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness. The Office has failed to meet its burden under number (1) above, as the cited reference fails to show each and every limitation of Applicants’ invention and there is no apparent reason for one skilled in the art to modify the reference to arrive at each and every limitation. It simply would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to arrive at Applicants’ claimed combinations.

Nishihira does not teach an injection molded part having a body injection-molded from a first plastic and a decorative side of a decoration applied to the surface of the body such that the decorative first side is visible through the body as required by claims 1 and 20. Rather, Nishihira discloses forming a molded piece 11 by injection molding, forming a printed ink layer 3 on the surface 11a and then curing. According to the specification of Nishihira, use of a thermoplastic resin or too thick of a layer of a thermosetting ink will result in the printed pattern being deformed by the melt flow of the resin during the subsequent injection molding. (See col. 2, lines 43-66). Thus, the ink layer of Nishihira is applied such that the rear side of the printed surface is applied to the molded piece 11. This is an important difference because by the arrangement as required by claims 1 and 20, the visible side of the decoration is covered by the basic body during the encapsulation, and is consequently protected from damage.

Appl. No. 10/535,436
Docket No. Z-7814Q
Reply to Office Action mailed on September 1, 2010
Customer No. 27752

Moreover, the deficiencies of Nishihira are not resolved by Morawski. Morawski is directed to a decorative pattern on a clear, heat shrinkable plastic film which is applied to a toothbrush body. There is no mention or teaching of applying a decoration so that the decorative side is visible through the body. Also, there is no motivation to combine a process that uses heat shrinkable films with a process that uses injection molding to form a decorative article.

References relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) must provide an enabling disclosure, i.e., they must place the claimed invention in the possession of the public. *In re Payne*, 203 U.S.P.Q. 245 (CCPA 1979). Because the cited references fail to teach all of the claim limitations of independent claims 1 and 20, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has not placed the presently claimed article and method in the possession of the public. Since claims 3, 5-9, 11-19 and 30 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and claims 21-29 depend directly or indirectly from claim 20, the cited references also fail to teach all of their claim limitations. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicants assert that claims 3, 5-9 and 11-19 and 21-30 are nonobvious over the cited references and are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the present application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, entry of the amendment presented herein reconsideration of this application, and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By /John P. Colbert/
Signature
John P. Colbert
Typed or Printed Name
Registration No. 45,765
(513) 983-6678

Date: November 23, 2010
Customer No. 27752